REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this Amendment After Final, Applicant proposes to amend claims 8 and 21 to place

them in better form for consideration on appeal, proposing to amend claim 8 to recite "A

microprocessor-implemented increment method of an incrementer", "incrementing, within the

microprocessor, each 4-bit group", and "outputting the whole increment value", and proposing to

amend claim 21 to recite "A microprocessor-implemented increment method", "performing,

within the microprocessor, a logical combination on the operand, the first logic state inclusion

information for each b-bit group, the flag information for each b-bit group, and the increment

value for each b-bit group", and "outputting the whole increment value". No new matter is

introduced.

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-28 were pending in the application. After

entry of this Amendment, claims 1-28 remain pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-14 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 101; and allowed claims 1-7, 15-20, 27, and 28.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's statement that claims 1-7, 15-20, 27,

and 28 are allowed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

As discussed above, Applicant proposes to amend claim 8 to recite "A microprocessor-

implemented increment method of an incrementer", "incrementing, within the microprocessor,

each 4-bit group", and "outputting the whole increment value", and to amend claim 21 to recite

"A microprocessor-implemented increment method", "performing, within the microprocessor, a

logical combination on the operand, the first logic state inclusion information for each b-bit

group, the flag information for each b-bit group, and the increment value for each b-bit group",
and "outputting the whole increment value".

At least partially as a result, Applicant submits that independent claim 8 (as well as
dependent claims 9-14) and independent claim 21 (as well as dependent claims 22-26) provide a
practical application that produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result. Furthermore, because
the methods of claims 8-14 and 21-26 are microprocessor-implemented, they do not preempt use
of the underlying algorithm. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that this amendment
overcomes the rejection of claims 8-14 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

<u>Request for Reconsideration and Allowance</u>

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the
rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-28 in connection with the present application is
earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present
application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone
number listed below.

If necessary, the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; in particular, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
703.668.8000

JAC/LFG/cm